

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT
(San Joaquin)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DANNY WILLIAMS,

Defendant and Appellant.

C046511

(Super. Ct. Nos.
SF079139A & SF081587A)

In June 2000, in San Joaquin County case No. SF079139A, defendant Danny Williams pled guilty to possession of cocaine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11350, subd. (a)) and to failure to appear (Pen. Code, § 1320, subd. (b)). Imposition of sentence was suspended and he was granted probation for five years.

In October 2003, in San Joaquin County case No. SF081587A, defendant pled guilty to possession of cocaine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11350, subd. (a)) and to unlawful taking of an automobile (Veh. Code, § 10851, subd. (a)). Imposition of

sentence was suspended and defendant was granted probation for five years.

On December 29, 2003, in San Joaquin County case No. SF090486A a violation of probation hearing in the above two cases was heard concurrently with defendant's preliminary hearing on a charge of forcible rape. (Pen. Code, § 261, subd. (a)(2).) Based upon the preliminary hearing testimony, defendant was found in violation of probation in each drug case.

In case No. SF079139A, defendant was sentenced to the middle term of two years for the possession of cocaine and a concurrent middle term of two years was imposed for the failure to appear. In case No. SF081587A, defendant was sentenced to the middle term of two years for the cocaine possession and two years for the unlawful taking of a vehicle, each sentence to run concurrent with each other and with the terms imposed in case No. SF079139A.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NICHOLSON, J.

We concur:

BLEASE, Acting P.J.

DAVIS, J.